VOL. XI. No. 9

Devoted to the advancement of a Universal Religion
fraternal, spiritual, free.

Universal Religion

Published monthly, from October to June, at Tacoma and Seattle.

DECEMBER, 1903.

MEMORIAL NUMBER

IN HONOR OF THE LATE

FRANCIS ELLINGWOOD ABBOT, PH. D.

Exercises at the Memorial Services held on Sunday, Nov. 1st, in the morning at Tacoma and in the evening at Seattle, conducted by Alfred W. Martin and John W. Roberts.

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE

SAMUEL COLLYER (Treas.) ALICE C. VANRUYPER

EDITOR, ALFRED W. MARTIN, WASHINGTON HOTEL, SEATTLE.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR, JOHN W. ROBERTS, 121 SOUTH G ST., TACOMA.

SUBSCRIPTION, $1.00 PER YEAR; SINGLE COPIES, 15 CENTS.

Address all business communications to

UNIVERSAL RELIGION, 213 CALIFORNIA BLDG., TACOMA, WN.

Entered at the post-office as second class matter.

THE ABBOT MEMORIAL.

The memorial services in honor of the late Dr. Francis Ellingwood Abbot was held at Tacoma and Seattle on Sunday, November 1st, at the former city in the morning and at the latter in the evening, and were conducted by Alfred W. Martin and John W. Roberts. The order of exercises was as follows:

I. Introductory sentences (from *The Index*).
II. Hymn—"Art Thou the Life" (F. E. Abbot).
III. Poem—"Beneath the Juniper the Prophet Old" (F. E. Abbot).
IV. Scripture selections (see infra. pp. 165-167).
V. Addresses (see infra. pp. 148-165).
VI. Hymn—"The Better Life" (F. E. Abbot).
VII. Closing Word.

The closing words spoken at the morning service by Mr. Roberts were taken from Dr. Abbot's first letter to the Tacoma Free Church:

"Stand fast by your principles with all the immobility of your own Mt. Tacoma! For they are the foundation of the moral universe itself, and on them you dedicate yourself to the Eternal God."

At the evening service the closing word spoken by Mr. Martin was a sentence from Dr. Abbot's essay on "World-Unity in Religion":

"Religion is not mere thinking or mere feeling or mere doing, but *living upward*, which is all of these in one; upward toward truth of thought, which is knowledge; upward toward truth of feeling, which in its highest form is love; upward toward truth of conduct, which is virtue—fulfillment of duty."

ADDRESS OF ALFRED W. MARTIN.

On the twenty-third day of October the last member of an illustrious trio passed away. All three were New Englanders; earnest, fearless, consecrated champions of free, spiritual and

universal religion. William James Potter closed his earthly career in December, 1893. Octavius Brooks Frothingham went to his earthly rest the day after Thanksgiving in 1895, and now the only remaining member of that famous front rank in the vanguard of liberalism has laid down his arms. In that great militant movement, thirty-five years ago, when the words freedom and progress were inscribed on the banner of an advancing and honorable Liberalism, the names of Abbot, Frothingham and Potter were on the lips of all in any degree familiar with the trend of religious progress. Abbot we name first, because his concern was with the foundation of free religion. He was the philosopher, par excellence, of the new forward movement; the crystal-clear thinker and systemizer, bearing a relation to free religion analagous to that of Herbert Spencer to evolution. Intellectually Abbot was the profoundest of the three, the closest thinker, the keenest and subtlest critic of the religions that were not free and of philosophies that were not scientific.

Frothingham was the orator and popularizer of free religion, the Huxley of the new movement, endowed with a capacity for making intelligible to his least instructed hearers the principles and ideals of free religion, gifted with power to present the new and unwelcome truth with a temperateness of phrase and sweetness of spirit that irresistibly carried conviction to thousands, entranced by his brilliant and lucid disquisition. Potter was the gentle knight, *sans peur et sans reproche.*

> "He never yit ne villaynie ne sayde
> In all his life, unto no manner wight,
> He was a very perfect, gentle knight."

Preacher and leader too, he was, though not in so superlative a degree as Frothingham. And logical withal, though not so relentlessly as Abbot, always ready to adjust the demands of logic to those of sympathy, yet never at the price of intellectual sincerity.

When the historian of religious progress in this country comes to the question of emancipation and asks who did most to free religion from the three successive dogmatisms (papal, bibli-

cal, intuitional) by which it was bound, he will answer, Abbot, Frothingham and Potter, for it was they who gave the stamp of *uncompromising* freedom to religion, refusing to stop at the half-way house of Unitarianism because it remains partly Christian and is not wholly free. And when that historian discusses the merits peculiar to each of these prophets and pioneers he will say that in the whole long line of religious leaders none was more entirely consecrated to the search for truth or more loyal in his pursuit of the moral ideal than Francis Ellingwood Abbot.

It is my good fortune to possess, besides priceless letters, a brief biographical sketch which he prepared at my request in the winter of '96.

From these sources of information, and from what I have learned in conversations with him during the past thirteen years, let me briefly recall the main events of his melodramatic career.

On the sixth of November, 1836, the same year in which Emerson enjoined the duty of enjoying "an original relation to the universe," Francis Ellingwood Abbot (who, perhaps, more than any of his contemporaries fulfilled this dictum) was born. His father, on graduating from Bowdoin College, was tutor and librarian of that institution, then professor of mathematics at Phillips Exeter Academy, and for twenty years from 1833 teacher of a private school for young ladies in Boston. He was a member, and for two years the recording secretary, of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was the author of several important articles on scientific subjects. In 1855 he was engaged to deliver a course of lectures on meteorology at the Lowell Institute, Boston, but the failure of his health broke up both the lectures and his school. Later he was principal of the high school in Beverly for several years. It was thus from his father that Dr. Abbot inherited those proclivities for scientific and philosophical study which it has been his life-work to cultivate and develop. On his mother's side he was a lineal descendent of Roger Conant who was, in truth, the first governor of the Massachusetts colony at Cape Ann. "There is not," he

once said, "a single drop of blood in my veins which is not derived from emigrant ancestors who settled in the colony of Massachusetts Bay prior to the year 1700." In the biographical sketch already referred to, Dr. Abbot says, "I am a Puritan of the Puritans and I consider that the 'Free Religion' to which I have given my life is but the logical and legitimate development of the principles which originally created Puritanism itself. In truth, the philosophy of free religion to which I have given thirty-seven years of labor and to which all my remaining years will be still devoted is, in my opinion, simply the philosophical explanation and justification of the United States Constitution; and its practical outcome can only be to interpret *true Americanism* to the world as 'freedom and fellowship' in religion in the form of the most absolute and universal *humanitarianism.*"

During his first three years at the Boston Latin School, Francis Abbot took thirteen prizes for proficiency in his studies, and at the end of the first four months of his schooling he was head of his class, and retained that position to the end of his course. In 1859 he was graduated from Harvard University, and some few years later there was conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, he being at that time one of the only five or six men upon whom Harvard University had ever conferred the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the department of philosophy. After spending one year in the Harvard Divinity School he went to Meadville, Pa., there to take the position of principal of the Female Seminary, and while teaching there he became a member of the Meadville (Unitarian) Theological School. It was there, too, in the summer of 1861, that he wrote a philosophical paper published as two articles in the *North American Review* for 1864 on "The Phenomena of Time and Space." The reception of these articles by scholars, both at home and abroad, was such as to open to him as brilliant prospects as any young man perhaps ever enjoyed. Speaking of these two articles, Professor Charles Eliot Norton, one of the most accomplished and critical of the scholars connected with Harvard University said: "The qualities displayed in these

papers are, in my judgment, of a very rare and high order. Mr. Abbot shows in them not only that he is a careful, thorough and capable student of philosophy, widely versed in past metaphysical speculations, but that he is also an exact and original thinker, able to express his thought in clear and vigorous language; and possessed of such sincerity of mind that his controlling object is not the maintenance of any special opinion, but the discovery of the truth. The fairness of his spirit is not less conspicuous than the force of his mind." And the distinguished scholar, Chauncey Wright, said: "I know of no philosophic writer in this country who surpasses him in vigor and clearness of style or in earnestness of devotion to the pursuit of true opinions in the abstruser matters of thought. He is singularly free from a love of mere subtilty as such and independent of its use for arriving at just philosophical conclusions. In other words, he is not a mere metaphysician, but a really earnest thinker who cannot fail to inspire the youths whom he may instruct with a sound and liberal spirit of inquiry."

During the year 1863-4, Dr. Abbot lived with his young family at Beverly, where his parents resided. In June, 1864, he was settled as pastor of the "First Unitarian Society of Christians in Dover, N. H." Up to that time Unitarianism had no collective creed, but in April, 1865, the denomination organized in national or collective form at New York and adopted the famous preamble, which became a very effective creed, exerting a most potent and disastrous influence upon the future professional career of Dr. Abbot. He vigorously opposed the adoption of that preamble and at the second national conference held in the following year at Syracuse, he tried to *reform* the preamble, proposing a substitute, but in vain. And his opposition, together with his effort at reform, put a black mark against his name, which soon proved to be the shutting of the doors of opportunity for all professional advancement. Foreseeing that the fact of this failure at Syracuse meant the inevitable exclusion of himself from the Unitarian ministry, he applied for the professorship of philosophy in Cornell Universi-

ty, which was to be opened in the fall of 1868. But President Andrew D. White said privately to the distinguished scholar Chauncey Wright (who himself informed Dr. Abbot of the remark) that he "wanted a broad churchman for the place." Meanwhile Professor Bowen of Harvard University (without Dr. Abbot's knowledge) endeavored to get him appointed as his assistant in the department of philosophy. But the appeal of Professor Bowen was rejected on the ground of Mr. Abbot's "radicalism," and so a second failure to secure a position as professor in a university had to be chronicled as part of the pathetic life-record of this brave and incorruptible man.

After being excluded from the Unitarian National Conference by its reaffirmation of the preamble-creed in 1866, Dr. Abbot still hoped that the denomination would plant itself on freedom of thought alone and give up its allegiance to the Christian confession. But seeing no hope of any such forward step he frankly informed the society in Dover of his conviction that he ought not to stand in any Christian pulpit as a minister of Christianity. He had outgrown the Christian confession of "discipleship to the Lord Jesus Christ," and so he resolutely, bravely and modestly acquainted his congregation with the fact. He preached his farewell sermon March 15th, 1868, telling the people that his "radicalism" had been *growing,* which proved that it was not dead, but alive. He told them he did not come to the parish with a theological hand-organ, manufactured and guaranteed under denominational patent to turn the crank and grind out the same old sectarian tunes, but that he came there to preach the pursuit of truth, to promote thought, rather than to lay down dogmatic opinions, and since he could no longer call himself a Christian, no longer consider himself a Unitarian, there was no alternative but to retire. And thus he bade the "First Unitarian Society of Christians in Dover" farewell. But at the door there met him a contingent of his friends, who were both numerous and strong. They besought him to stay in Dover and organize a new society on his own terms. He accepted the proposition, and the "First Independent Society of Dover" was soon completely organized.

Now it happened that these friends were also a majority of the members of the old Unitarian Society, and consequently they conceived that they had a perfect right to control the use of the Unitarian building. The minority, however, did not hold that view, and the result was that three hotly-contested parish debates were held, and the majority won, taking possession of the building and holding their meetings thenceforth in that place. But their success gave rise to a famous lawsuit, and the opinions of the justices of the Supreme Judicial Court of New Hampshire in this case cover two hundred and eighty pages of a closely-printed octavo volume. In the course of this lawsuit, the wardens of the new society were treacherously induced by their counsel to take the ground that they were not a new society at all, but only the radical wing of the old society. He informed them that unless they took that stand they could not win the lawsuit nor keep the building, so they chose to follow his advice in spite of the beseechings of their minister to stand rigidly by their faith as they originally expressed it. In spite of his protestations against their betrayal of their common cause and of him, they won the lawsuit, and kept the building, but they lost their man, who instantly resigned October 1st, 1868. After this lawsuit was brought to a close, the Supreme Court of New Hampshire decreed as follows:

"It is ordered that said Jasper H. York, George L. Folsom and Carl H. Horsch, wardens of said First Unitarian Society of Christians in Dover, and all other wardens and members of said society, be jointly and severally strictly enjoined and forbidden to hire, employ, allow, suffer or permit said Francis E. Abbot, or any other person, to preach and inculcate in the meeting-house of said society doctrines subversive of the fundamental principles of Christianity, as generally received and holden by the denomination of Christians known as Unitarians; or to employ, suffer or permit to preach in said meeting-house any person who rejects Christianity altogether; or who teaches that, as a system of religion, Christianity is partly true and partly false; or who preaches and inculcates a disbelief in the doctrine of the Lordship and Messiahship of Jesus Christ, as taught by him in the New Testament Scriptures, or a disbelief in Jesus Christ as the great head of the church, or of his divine mission

and authority as a religious teacher, as this is taught by him; or who preaches and inculcates a denial of the doctrine that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments do contain a divine revelation given by inspiration of God, and containing a sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practice;

"And that said Francis E. Abbot, and all and every other person or persons, be forever strictly enjoined and forbidden to occupy said meeting-house of said society for the purpose of preaching and inculcating said disbeliefs, denials and doctrines hereinbefore specially prohibited to be taught therein; and any and all other doctrine or doctrines subversive of the fundamental principles of Christianity, as generally received and holden by the denomination of Christians known as Unitarians."

This decree, sad to relate, has never been repealed. It is still in full force today. And in open violation of that decree a succession of ministers has occupied the Dover pulpit and at least one has preached precisely such doctrines as Dr. Abbot was forbidden to preach.

Fortunately, the day after this decree was issued, two pupils turned up, enabling Dr. Abbot to support his family, as he had no resources to fall back upon. He stayed in Dover another year, delivering in the winter of 1868-9 a course of twelve free lectures on Sunday evenings in the City Hall. But during the time that he was engaged in the task of teaching, which to him was most uncongenial, several invitations from the Unitarian society in Toledo, Ohio, came to him, and every one in turn was resolutely rejected. But the Toledo people were persistent, and their persistency resulted in the engagement of Dr. Abbot for the months of July and August, 1869. He was to preach for these two months, and if at the end of that time the members decided that they would cease to exist as Unitarians and become free, a vote should be taken upon the matter and Dr. Abbot's settlement should be determined by that vote. The experiment was a success. The Unitarians of Toledo severed their connection with Christianity and with Unitarianism and employed Dr. Abbot as their pastor, which position he filled for nearly four years. While there as minister of the "First Independent Society of Toledo," Dr. Abbot started a small periodical known as

The Index, a "Weekly Journal of Free Religion," What William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* was to politics, that Abbot's *Index* was to religion. Garrison's *Liberator* has become a historical flag of liberty, and Abbot's *Index* will not be "forgotten nor unsung" in that day "when America wears as her jewels the names of those who set free her heart and brain." That weekly journal stood for three fundamental American rights, the three in one, a trinity if you will, the only trinity that its editor was willing to acknowledge, the trinity of free thought, free speech and a free press. But the two business managers of *The Index* proved to be unscrupulous and involved the editor in heavy debts to save his paper. Indeed, so great were his embarrassments that he resolved to move from Toledo to Boston, and there under better auspices continue the publication of the journal. Thither, in the hot summer of 1873, he moved with his family and the arduous labor entailed by this change was such as to cause the breakdown of his wife's health and to bring upon her an increasing invalidism, which finally terminated her life in October, 1893, inflicting the deepest wound upon this true and tried soul, a wound that never ceased to bleed. With no money saved, no pulpit open to him, with his radicalism growing from year to year, and with a family of four to support, *The Index* out of his hands, and himself deeply in debt, what was he to do? Refusal to speak the Unitarian shibboleth had enabled him to keep his selfrespect, but little else. It meant lifelong exile from the profession he yet supremely loved. The only alternative was teaching. At the suggestion of a friend he went to New York and opened, on Madison avenue, a "Classical School for Boys." There he met with fair success, but how brilliant a success would his enterprise have been had he been an Episcopalian, receiving the recommendations of Episcopal clergymen and thus ingratiating himself with certain rich men the teaching of whose sons would have given him ample means for the support of himself and family. After a year of misery and isolation in New York, he returned to Cambridge, where he had established his family, and at once converted his home into

a boarding school for boys, preparing them for entering Harvard College. That plan proved financially successful, but for him, a philosopher by training and inclination, it was drudgery in the extreme. Fortunately, in 1892 a legacy was left him which enabled him thenceforth to devote all his time to philosophical work. Under the crushing weight of an ineffable grief he resolved, for the sake of her whose death was "the costliest sacrifice on the altar of Free Religion," to finish, if possible, the "Prolegomena to Science," or "Syllogistic Philosophy," on which he had been at work and which he alone of living men could complete. With adamantine inflexibility he held to his resolution and on the thirteenth day of October the thousand and fifty pages of manuscript were tied up, ready for his literary executor to put them into print if this should prove possible. Ten days later,—the tenth anniversary of the death of his wife—a telegram brought the news of his own decease that very day.

Turn for a moment to the portrait of our lamented leader and see how his character is delineated in the finely chiselled face. The immense forehead is that of a reasoner, the eyes bespeak love of the ethical ideal and loyal pursuit of it. The straight nose and firm lips suggest fidelity and accuracy; reverence and refinement are written on the features, the countenance indicates scholarship, culture, a noble ancestry; the portrait is that of a thinker, a man of learning and of high attainments.

Of all the noble traits of his character, I think sincerity was the most conspicuous and such was my personal relation to him that I was privileged to appreciate the exceptional degree to which he possessed this virtue. Such was his sincerity that whether it was a person, a society, a doctrine or an institution that confronted him, so help him God, he could not do otherwise than speak out exactly what he thought, conceding nothing to timid counsels, or retarding compromises or tarnished ideals. And this inflexible allegiance to his conviction plus the often blunt, bald and untempered form of its expression gave rise to the notion that he was dogmatic. Yet never was man less dogmatic than he. For what is a dogmatist? One who affirms with-

out offering valid evidence for his assertion. But it was the invariable practice of Dr. Abbot not only to demand valid evidence from others for their affirmations, but also to meet every demand for proofs that others might broach. Again, because he dealt with the philosophy of religion, specialized on the intellectual aspect of religion, seeking the *thought* in which religion is rooted, relentlessly logical in his thinking and insisting in season and out of season on the necessity of logic if the foundation of religion is to be firm and enduring, people described him as being "purely intellectual" and giving no scope to the emotional side of human nature. A shallow, worthless criticism this. For the marvel of his work is that having, in truth, so poetical a temperament, rich in finest, tenderest feeling and singularly responsive to all noble sentiment, he succeeded so completely in preventing the intrusion of feeling into the province of truth-seeking where the intellect should hold sole sway. And we who have been admitted into the sanctuary of his loyal, loving, grieving heart, remember how irresistibly came our tears as he touched with tenderest tones upon the vicissitudes of his eventful, pathetic career, and his deepening trust in the God of truth and right and love.

Equally removed from servile imitation and conceited self-assertion, the shining merit of his thinking was that he serenely trusted his own soul, wrestled indomitably at first hand with the most difficult problems, his eye all the while fixed on his subject rather than on what others had written about it, and finally wrought out results that are certain to be some day studied, understood, appreciated.

That he should have shocked both the Orthodox and the Unitarians is not surprising. When an admiral launches his double-decker we expect more commotion than when a fisherman pushes off his dory. So this admiral in the navy of Free Religion, launching his good ship with its two decks, freedom and fellowship, inevitably caused considerable commotion in the orthodox and Unitarian seas. At Syracuse in 1866, when Unitarianism turned its back on freedom and in consequence drove out of its fellowship its leading representatives, Dr. Abbot felt as Moses

did when he came down from Sinai with the tables of the law and saw the Israelites dancing round the golden calf. Yet like Moses he strove to be patient with ignorance and stupidity, recalling the maxim, "mit der Dummheit kaempfen die Goetter vegebens." He was no Melanchthon with pale blood in his veins, but rather a Luther, whose whole being burned with passionate love of truth and with firm yet humble consciousness that the truth in philosophy was his.

Bold and fearless, sincere and consecrated, original and modest, radical and reverent; intellectually profound, morally incorruptible, spiritually intense and deep, such was Francis Ellingwood Abbot.

Of him we all must say with Dr. Robert Collyer, "We are all his debtors because of the great principles which he bought at so great a cost and never sold."

ADDRESS OF JOHN W. ROBERTS.

A twenty-minutes' discourse on some of the contributions made by Dr. Abbot to religious progress must be a very inadequate treatment of such a large and serious subject. But it is not as technical theologians or professional philosophers or critical historians that we meet together this morning. We have lost a friend and in the privacy of our own family circle we wish to talk over some of those things which are now very near to our hearts. None but the master could blame him and none but the master can praise him. But we of the plain people who knew him loved him and it is out of a heart full of affection that I now venture to say a few words concerning the work of so distinguished a man.

It is always hazardous to conjecture what might have been, but it is also true that the keener our sense of possibilities the higher the order of our intelligences. So I am going to ask at the very outset, What would free religion have been but for the self-sacrificing labors of Francis Ellingwood Abbot? The Free Religious Association was the first organization ever founded in America on the basis of free thought concerning matters re-

ligious. But who gave the initial impulse which resulted in the founding of this association? It was Dr. Abbot. *The Index*, issued weekly for ten years, was the first periodical ever published in America in the interest of free religion. But who was the man that stood ready to assume the responsibilities and perform the arduous duties of editing such an unpopular organ? It was Dr. Abbot. In the early '70s the religious liberties of our American republic became endangered and a very determined effort was made by the Christians to amend our national constitution in the interest of Christianity. In 1872 a national convention met in Cincinnati for the avowed purpose of committing our nation to an acknowledgment of God "as the author of its existence and the source of its authority, of Jesus Christ as its ruler, and of the Bible as the foundation of its laws and the supreme rule of its conduct." And for the time being it seemed as if no one was willing to utter a word of protest against such a contemplated subversion of our ancient liberties. Even the most liberal Christian churches, the Unitarian and Universalist, seemed to have sympathized with the object of that convention. But fortunately there was one man at least who on this occasion, as on many another, had the courage of his convictions. And Francis Ellingwood Abbot went to Cincinnati and in the presence of the Christian delegates there assembled read a carefully prepared remonstrance against the very purpose of the convention. He began by calling attention to the fact that the proposed amendment would disfranchise all but Christian believers. And then he proceeded to warn them against the danger involved in such an usurpation of power and the "establishment of a Christian oligarchy on the ruins of a free republic." "It is a wild and insane delusion," said he, "to expect that the great body of freedom-lovers will ever submit voluntarily, or can be made to submit by force, to any such outrageous oppression, whether in the name of God or man. I make no threat whatever, but I state a truth fixed as the hills when I say that before you can carry this measure and trample on the freedom of the people, you will have to wade through seas of blood. Every man who favors

it votes to precipitate the most frightful war of modern times." But Dr. Abbot did not content himself with a verbal remonstrance. He forthwith initiated a movement for the organization of all liberal minded people in the nation, with the view of protecting our national liberties against the dangers to which they were then so obviously exposed. And liberal leagues began to spring up in many cities, villages, and hamlets until in 1876 a sufficient number of local societies was formed to warrant the organization of a National Liberal League at the Centennial celebration in Philadelphia. At that first centennial congress of liberals Dr. Abbot was made the president of the National League and he continued to serve it faithfully in that capacity until 1878, when an issue arose in the League over the circulation of obscene literature through the mail which for ethical reasons forced him to withdraw. And in thus withdrawing from an organization which he founded and loved, but which had been committed by the majority to ideals offensive to his moral conscience he illustrated that valuable peculiarity in his character which always forbade him to make concessions and compromises. He gave no quarter to any kind of liberty that was not at the same time obedient to the laws of truth, justice, and moral purity.

The impartial history of the liberal religious movement in America still remains to be written, but no account of this movement could be even approximately complete that did not include the story of the Free Religious Association, *The Index,* and the National Liberal League. We may never be able to determine accurately the precise causes to which our progress in religion has been due. And there may be some who doubt if any real progress has been made. But should it ever turn out that honors are finally awarded to liberalism for services rendered to mankind these three enterprises must come in for a large share of that award. And then may we not forget that but for Dr. Abbot there might never have been any Free Religious Association, or any *Index*, or any National Liberal League. To ascribe honor to whom honor is due is a sacred obligation.

My time is so short that I will not attempt to say anything

about the two books which Dr. Abbot wrote, "Scientific Theism" and "The Way Out of Agnosticism." I hope that on some future occasion we shall have the opportunity to make a careful study of these two works as well as of the one now in manuscript form, "The Syllogistic Philosophy." Meanwhile I commend the two former to your careful reading, promising you a rich reward for your labors.

But now newspapers and periodicals and books and leagues and associations are after all transient things. Even empires decline and fall. Yes, races become extinct and the time is sure to come when all living things must pass away from this planet. The energies of the material world are finite. Fire makes ashes but ashes make no fires. And no one knew this better than Dr. Abbot. So it would be of very slight consequence to him to be credited with any of the things we have thus far mentioned. Of all men he was the last to be satisfied with the passing shows of earth. The light in his friendly eyes was the light of the eternal and his conversations always turned to the permanent things that remain. So in the few minutes that are left let me speak to you of one or two things which I believe will always remain to keep his memory sweet and green.

And in the first place then, Dr. Abbot made a generous contribution to religious progress in that he established a test for the truth of religious propositions. He did not discover this test—that was the work of many minds—but the application of the test to religion was something of an innovation; at least it was this in his day.

The dogmas of religion had often been called into question. There had always been some who doubted the Genesis story of creation, the biblical account of man's origin, the fall of man in Adam, and the salvation of man in Christ, but there was one rock on which criticism was always shattered. And this was the rock of the supernatural origin of religious propositions. And so long as this rock continued to remain in the paths of human thought the approach to the harbor of truth was cut off. For centuries the theologians and religious philosophers had been

content to accept as true whatever could be traced to a supernatural origin. The nature of the thing revealed counted for nothing so long as the fact of its revelation remained secure. And beliefs which outraged both our intelligences and our hearts were accepted as the word of God solely on the authority of some man who claimed that his ideas had come to him by inspiration.

Such, I say, was the test of religious truth in the last decades of the century just closed. And it is to Dr. Abbot's everlasting credit that he saw the fallacy of judging the truth of any proposition by its origin. For it was he who insisted in season and out of season that religious truths must be tested by the same principles which govern the discovery of truth in all the other branches of science. In the Horticultural Hall address delivered in Boston in 1872 he said that what was wanted in religion now "is not the discovery of a new method, but the expansion and universal acceptance of the method already crowned with such magnificent and triumphant laurels—the method of science itself. Observation and experiment, induction and deduction, the recognition of all facts, inward and outward, and the application of every mental faculty to interpret them and discover all their bearings—this is the method already organized and of unquestioned authority in physical investigations, which is destined to become supreme also in every province of human thinking. The conquest of one dogmatic system by another is of trivial consequence; the pathway of philosophy is white with the bleaching bones of such systems. But the establishment of a new method is of vast moment, for it means the determination of a new road for the human mind."

In order that you may realize how truly prophetic were these words of thirty years ago I wish to call your attention, in passing, to the resemblance between this method of science so warmly praised and advocated by Dr. Abbot and the empirical method illustrated in a recent work on religion by the foremost philosopher of our age. As some of you may know, the naturalists have lately been treading in the footsteps of the supernaturalists and have sought to discredit religion on the same

ground as the supernaturalists sought to credit her—on the ground of origin. Extended investigations have been carried on and books voluminous, if not luminous, have been written to show that all religious beliefs are the fruits of abnormal minds and unstable nerves and that on account of this lowly—not to say disreputable—origin religion in any form should be eschewed. So in his recent admirable book on religious experiences, Prof. James takes these naturalists to task for violating the empirical test of truth and judging ideas and beliefs by their origin. But this empirical test so skilfully used by James against the fallacious reasoning of the naturalists is substantially the same thing as the scientific method so ably and enthusiastically defined by Dr. Abbot some thirty years ago.

In closing I must make a very brief reference to Dr. Abbot's attitude toward Christianity. As so many of you know he refused to be called a Christian, but I do not think that his motives in doing so were ever very well understood. Christianity to many people, especially in his day, was a synonym for truth and goodness and holiness, and an attack on the Christian religion was popularly construed as an attack on these lofty principles. But nothing could be further from his thought than this. I do not believe that there ever was a man who was more thoroughly consecrated to noble ideals than was Francis Ellingwood Abbot. And it behooves us to reflect whether his dissatisfaction with Christianity was not based upon reasons which we also might do well to consider. The human heart is prodigal in its affections, and its love has been bestowed upon all forms of iniquity. And the mere fact that a religion happens to be entrenched in our hearts is no warrant for its truth. Even Christianity itself testifies to this. For how else could it have been possible for so many Christian believers to accept the heartless doctrine of infant damnation? Love surely did not demand it. And if the influences of the heart were the only influences that determined our beliefs the conception of hell would never have been born. No! man needs to think as much as he needs to feel, and the emotions are as much in need of control as are steam, gun-cotton,

and electricity. The heart *is* the power and without its loves and passions we can do nothing. But it is a blind power equally ready to bless or to curse. And it is upon the intellect that the duty of wise guidance devolves. Let us ponder these things as we think of Dr. Abbot's attitude toward Christianity.

I close as I began. Not as critics and trained philosophers do we meet this morning. We have lost a friend and it is out of a heart full of affection that we have spoken.

SCRIPTURE SELECTIONS.

(From the published writings of Dr. Abbot. Read by Mr. Roberts).

I.

Civilization is immensely older than Christianity, and can not be caused by it any more than a father can be begotten by his own child.

The human soul has written all the Bibles, organized all the churches, appointed all the prophets and Christs. And it asserts forevermore its own superiority to all of its own creations.

The very same reverence for the soul itself that forbade Jesus to bow before Moses forbids us to bow before Jesus.

Policy holds its peace; Principle bears its witness. Policy buries its talent in the earth; Principle puts out its talent at interest, and makes it two. Policy is non-committal; Principle commits itself.

The tree is dead which adds not every year a new ring to its girth; and we are dead, if we add not perpetually to the quantity of our being.

The chief end of life is to make the most of our human nature, educate it, train it, foster it, bring out of it the divine music that awaits only the master's hand to strike dumb with shame the singing spheres.

It is the capacities of human nature, not the realities of human character, that feed the fires of a wise faith in man.

There can be no one fixed ideal for all men, nor for one man at all times.

It is the little frictions of common experience, the temptations to small deceptions, the wear and tear of small anxieties, the nettle-stings of small provocations, the thorn-like asperities of small disappointments, that constitute the crucial test of character.

The cares of life, with all their annoyance and fatigue, are the soil from which the faithful soul extracts the elements of a divine and most precious perfume.

Prayer, like love, must be experienced, it cannot be cut and dried in a formula.

No soul can rightly pray whose life is not a prayer.

I should be false to my own nature if I should disparage prayer or treat it as something to be outgrown. It is because I reverence true prayer profoundly that I refuse to make it a mere part of a regular routine, or to degrade it into a mere conventional form which is never to be omitted.

None but the frank and brave spirit can be a friend. So delicate is the relationship that the breath of distrust blights it at once.

Better respect without friendship than friendship without respect.

The characters of men are never ripened into mellowness until they have been watered with the gall of bitterness.

We are never initiated into the brotherhood of souls until we have been baptized with the baptism of blood,—consecrated by the universal sacrament of tears.

(From letters written by Dr. Abbot to Mr. Martin and read by him).

II.

Be true to your ideal and it will be true to you. Die if need be, but never give in!

Dying is a long job sometimes. It may mean a life of outward pain and inward peace. But that is nothing; we must be true.

Follow the guide of the Eternal Spirit through all vicissi-

tudes. It leads to what the heart of man has never yet conceived in all its glory. I thrill with veneration for the mind that so dedicates itself to the inflexible truth and obeys the unchangeable law.

We must burn our ships behind us or victory will never be ours.

Do the thing that is true even against the pleadings of affection; never stop short of truth out of accommodation to those who are not persuaded of it.

Never be a party to the suppression of truth and leave policy severely alone.

Even our petty lives take on something of dignity and worth if they are lived in accordance with the Divine Ideal.

Life is a series of swiftly dissolving views. Nothing in it is stable but the universal truth, righteousness, love—in a word God. We learn to live for these.

Is there no difference between the partisan and the patriot? Does the patriot become a partisan, when, with other patriots, he fights against partisanship? No, the league of patriots against partisanship is not itself partisanship, and the league of free souls against sectarianism is not itself sectarianism.

Religion is truth put to its uses in life. Religion is experience, science is reason; the two interpenetrate everywhere and condition each other. The effort to perfect oneself must be guided by true thought of the perfect and the true thought of the perfect must be embodied in life and effort, otherwise neither is worth anything.

Grief is only the other side of love and I would rather live on in grief than know that my grief and my love died together.

Faith in truth and right guided by wisdom and reason will make you omnipotent.

At the close of these readings Mr. Martin said:

Let us be grateful to the Giver of all life for the gift of so consecrated and incorruptible a soul, for the revelation of the Divine that has come to us from this Son of Light, for the im-

mortal message of life's mission which he unfolded and the immortal example of a life lived in loyal devotion to the Ideal.

Let it be our prayer that the same spirit of purity and consecration and service that was in him may be more and more in us, to the end that we, too, may be partakers with him of the life everlasting.